

FIRST SHAUGHNESSY ADVISORY DESIGN PANEL MINUTES

DATE: November 12, 2015

TIME: 4:00 pm

PLACE: Town Hall Meeting Room, Vancouver City Hall

PRESENT: MEMBERS OF THE FIRST SHAUGHNESSY DESIGN PANEL:

Hanako Amaya	BCSLA
Dallas Brodie	Vice Chair, Resident, SHPOA
Donna Chomichuk	BCSLA
Linda Collins	Chair, Resident
D'Arcy Jones	AIBC
Jim Huffman	AIBC
Peter Kappel	Resident, SHPOA
Richard Keate	Vancouver Heritage
David Nelson	SHPOA
Frank Shorrock	SHPOA

CITY STAFF:

Colin King	Development Planner
Georgina Lyons	Development Planner
Lidia McLeod	Urban Design Coordinator
Ulla Viktor	Development Planner

LIAISONS:

Melissa de Genova	City Councillor
-------------------	-----------------

REGRETS:	George Affleck	City Councillor
	Joanne Giesbrecht	REBGV
	John Madden	Resident
	Mollie Massie	Vancouver Heritage
	Kathy Reichert	Vice Chair, Resident

RECORDING

SECRETARY: Sally Hiller

ITEMS REVIEWED AT THIS MEETING

1037 West King Edward

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Collins called the meeting to order at 4:00pm and noted the presence of a quorum.

Business:

The Development Planner discussed the project at 1037 West King Edward in terms of the previous Panel meeting in 2013 and the rezoning process. The Panel was told:

1. Now the FS HCA has been passed the rezoning is legislated so the City is free to proceed with the rezoning.
2. This project does not have to conform to the Design Guidelines because as soon as the property is rezoned it will have different zoning and therefore will not have to comply with the HCA Design Guidelines.
3. Even if the Panel votes against this project Planning could and would still approve it.*

Project Updates:

1263 Balfour Avenue	Returning to Panel December 3, 2015
1937 West 19th Avenue	This project will not be returning to Panel. Staff confident any future concerns can be resolved through process.

Review of minutes:

N/A

The Panel considered one Application for presentation

Address: 1037 West King Edward Avenue
 Description: Rezoning for High Density Rental Housing Project
 Review: Application (First) Second appearance
 Architect: Shape Architecture
 Delegation: Nick Sully, Nathaniel Funk - Shape Architecture, Jennifer Stamp, Landscape Architect - Durante Kreuk Architecture

EVALUATION: NON-SUPPORT (2 in favour, 7 opposed)

*item amended at the meeting on February 4, 2016

Planning Comments:

Rezoning application under the Citywide IRP Rezoning Policy for consideration by Panel under the provisions of the First Shaughnessy Heritage Conservation Area as they relate to Section 5: Rezonings for Affordable Housing, Rental Housing and Special Needs Housing. The application proposes a four-story residential building comprised of 36 secured rental units.

FS Rezoning Policy:

On certain arterial streets, rezoning applications its support of and in accordance with Council policies regarding affordable housing, rental housing and special needs housing may be considered. Such rezoning applications will only be considered on sites that:

- (a) do not contain protected heritage property
- (b) do not contain buildings that, in the opinion of the Director of Planning, have heritage character or heritage value
- (c) are located on West King Edward Avenue, Granville Street or West 16th Avenue; and
- (d) have a rear lane

Rezoning must comply with the First Shaughnessy Heritage Area Design Guidelines and with all applicable Council policies and guidelines.

Please see additional text from sections 5.1 & 5.2 of the HCA Design Guidelines - page 7

Questions to Panel:

1. Single family development in First Shaughnessy emphasizes the transition from the street to the house by defining the front yard as a semi-enclosed space defined by the arrangement of trees, hedges, walls or other landscaping devices.

With this in mind, staff are seeking advice from the Panel as it relates to the West King Edward Avenue frontage as follows:

- Does the proposed development successfully transition in scale from the commercial development of Oak Street to the single family scale of FSD?
- Can the Panel comment on the success of the proposed setbacks, massing and landscape to the West King Edward Avenue frontage as they relate to balancing the intent of front yard layering in FSD with multiple family use?

2. Single family development in First Shaughnessy typically requires large side yards to create a buffer between the new development and adjacent sites.

- Can the Panel comment on the success of massing and landscape proposals to the west side yard as it relates to contextual fit with adjacent single family development?

3. Does the Panel support the proposed form of development as it relates to height and massing?

Applicant's Introductory Comments:

Design along the eastern edge of the site considered the commercial mixed use of this area and responded to that adjacency. A four story massing was opted for along that edge. The second massing, stepping down towards the south side of the site, transitions to

a three story massing along the western edge. These are three bedroom townhouses, stepping down to a two bedroom on the corner.

The massing along the south (King Edward) is the massing you'd find along a boulevard; with very wide setbacks. The reading of the massing at ground level really appears to be of two stories, not three.

Along the west side, there is a two story massing; one and two bedroom units, graduating down into the First Shaughnessy neighbourhood.

Distance between buildings was guided by surrounding adjacency between buildings, with a wider adjacency along the east/west travelling lane. A four metre setback at the top level, stepping down to five and six meters at some of the entrance points along the side, allow for landscaping along that edge.

The aim has been to get as much air, light and passive design into the space as possible. Light analyses indicate that apartments would receive above average light. Collaboration with the Landscape Architect have explored how to activate the courtyard spaces, making them animated and livable.

Landscape:

Landscape is a defining characteristic of the neighbourhood. Mature street trees give the area a sense of enclosure; with filigree, layering and peek-a-boo views into the property. We've looked to integrate some of these strategies here, in an edited format.

Along the south are several layers of planting including a row of trees inside the property line and a stone wall with metal fence (not dissimilar to those in the area). The common entry antechamber, features landscape walls, overhead trellis, seating, lighting and signage. The western path is chicaned, with garden walls.

Along the west is a row of trees, a row of hedging and some foundation planting adjacent to the path way, and up against the building. Four very large spruce trees, measuring 14 – 25m, have been retained.

Greenery on roof levels and the three courtyards – most significantly the central one – could be used by children. Any tree planting will provide livability, whilst being mindful of tree height (shading), and acoustics. More courtyard design development is pending.

Panel Commentary:

The panel was generally in favour of increasing the southern setback along West King Edward to thirty feet to bring the development more in line with the neighbourhood context. There was also concern about the lack of northern elevation setback.

Resounding comments were in support of increasing landscaping across the entire development. Suggestions included: landscaping along King Edward to allow for greater amenity for residents, using landscaping to assist the transition from commercial to First Shaughnessy, landscaping on second story roofs and on the northern elevation of the building, and including more mature trees.

"I find the proposed (front elevation or southern property edge) setback of 11.2 feet is not in keeping with the FSOPD and Design Guidelines. I would like to see the front set back increased to the relaxable front setback of 30 feet. This would help to maintain the layering and filigree of trees and shrubs that is prominent and part of the heritage look of First Shaughnessy thereby creating a streetscape in keeping with the Design Guidelines. I respect the need for more density on this site but the outer perimeter of First Shaughnessy needs to be carefully maintained as it is the gateway to our newly designated historic area"

Katherine Reichert Vice-chair FSODP

It was noted the project increased in size since last before Panel and now has even less of a front yard setback.

There were comments the project was not compatible with or a contextual fit with the neighbourhood, It was noted the building does not relate to the First Shaughnessy District as its form and function appear too institutional.

It was commented there are no grassy areas for children to play. The covered courtyards will be too dark and should be places with more activity.

The panel were concerned about excessive amounts of paving, and it was felt that the front yard as an antechamber, as discussed in the Design Guidelines, was missing.

There were concerns about the building mass and the courtyard spaces, specifically around the livability of the bridge massing, and the amount of sunlight to some apartments and to the internal courtyards, which were mostly covered.

In this regard, it was suggested that courtyards could be opened up to the sky to increase light, that a more central pedestrian access might increase activation of the courtyard areas, and that the walkway along the western side should be more internal to the project to activate that open space area.

The panel supported the proposed massing transition from four stories on the commercial side of the development, down to two on the western side. There was also support for third and fourth storey balconies.

There were comments the units facing east towards the lane would be improved with balconies inset into the building face. These balconies could provide some greenery in the laneway.

It was commented there was a missed opportunity to allot some parking spaces to car share programs.

Chair Summary:

Thank you for presenting this project today. With regard to the West King Edward elevation, a 30 foot setback as required by the Design Guidelines would create a front yard for children to play and provide a character-defining entrance to the First Shaughnessy Heritage neighbourhood from Oak Street.

There is support for the the four story massing stepping down from the commercial side on the east elevation to the residential on the west elevation.

The panel commented that the courtyards could use more work to increase light (possibly by opening them up to the sky). More consideration needs to be given to activating the courtyard spaces, making them livelier. There was a comment that having recessed balconies along the eastern laneway could allow in more sunlight.

In further summarizing the panel's comments, The Design Guidelines are referenced:

Historic Design Elements of First Shaughnessy:

2.2 calls for generously landscaped front yards, and long vistas of richly landscaped front yards in keeping with the streetscape.

2.3 refers to the "antechamber" (the front yard to the street) with spacial qualities... the antechamber expression relies on heavy enclosure from the street in order to present the estate scale legacy.

3.2 discusses compatible design, in particular section

(c) sensitive building placement having regard to adjacent sites, privacy and overlook, and preservation of open space between buildings.

3.3.3 Retention of mature trees and landscape.

All development must retain mature trees and landscaping. Conservation of on-site heritage features such as hedgerows, distinct gardens or similar features is strongly encouraged.

3.6.3 Principal Building Massing and Siting.

Principal buildings must be compatible with and generally consistent in scale, mass, and proportion to neighbouring buildings within the streetscape context. New development and renovations and alterations must not overwhelm the street.

5.2 General Form of Development.

The general form of development will be evaluated based on the following:

(a) minimum side, rear and front yard requirements should be met.

Additional comments by the panel included concern about excessive paving, that the mass was too institutional and may overwhelm the street, that the north elevation would benefit from more of a setback, and be further improved with the addition of landscaping on the upper levels. The primary pedestrian southwest entrance could be made larger, moved and or added to a courtyard.

The second story balconies should be strong enough to allow for trees and greenery.

Adjournment:

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:39 pm.

5.1 Criteria for Rezoning Consideration of rezoning proposals is limited to sites and developments that meet the following criteria:

- (a) the site does not contain protected heritage property;
- (b) the site does not contain buildings that, in the opinion of the Director of Planning, have heritage character or heritage value;
- (c) the site is located on West King Edward Avenue, Granville Street, or West 16th Avenue;
- (d) the site has a rear lane;
- (e) the application is based on city-wide policies seeking to increase the choices for affordable, rental, and special needs housing;
- (f) the proposed development demonstrates compatibility with adjacent development and with the heritage conservation area; and
- (g) the proposed development complies with the intent and objectives of these guidelines.

5.2 General Form of Development

The form of a multiple dwelling residential development differs from the single family development that is characteristic of First Shaughnessy. Some variations to the built form described in these guidelines may be necessary to reconcile these differences. Any variations will be assessed on a case by case basis specific to the site and context in terms of urban design performance as it relates to compatibility with the character of the neighbourhood. The general form of development will be evaluated based on the following:

- (a) minimum side, rear and front yard requirements should be met;
- (b) if development occurs beside a site with non-conforming yards:
 - i. the case of front yards, new development should provide a transition from an existing non-conforming front yard to a conforming front yard setback; and
 - ii. in the case of side yards, new development should be generally consistent with the existing development pattern and should include a landscape design consistent with these guidelines, to create a buffer between the new development and adjacent sites;
- (c) additional density may be considered if appropriate to context, and subject to consideration of shadow analysis, view impacts, frontage length, building massing, setbacks and similar issues and to a demonstration of community support;
- (d) existing height limits must be met;
- (e) the roof design requirements in these guidelines may not be compatible with a multi residential development and roof design may vary subject to general compatibility with the streetscape context;
- (f) landscape design should demonstrate enclosure, screening, layering, filigree, filtering, and revealing, as outlined in these guidelines;
- (g) protected trees and mature landscaping must be retained;
- (h) landscape design for multiple dwelling residential use must carefully integrate the following:
 - i. pedestrian circulation,
 - ii. outdoor amenity and play areas suitable for families, and
 - iii. vehicle circulation and parking;
- (i) landscaping and building materials must be of the high quality, detailing, and authenticity required by these guidelines; and
- (j) delivery of ground-oriented housing for families